



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,111	12/09/2005	Harlan A. Hurwitz	115572.02	4391
25944 7590 05/28/2008 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
MAGUIRE, LINDSAY M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3692				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/28/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/524,111

Applicant(s)

HURWITZ ET AL.

Examiner

LINDSAY M. MAGUIRE

Art Unit

3692

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 24 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 February 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/10/05
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Non-Final office action is in response to the application filed on December 9, 2005 and the response to the Restriction/Election requirement filed on February 26, 2008.

Election/Restrictions

Claims 20-23 and 25-64 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on February 26, 2008.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because Figure 1 should be labeled as "Prior Art". Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the

remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Abstract

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, there is a disconnect between the preamble and the body of the claim. Specifically, the preamble of the claim states, "a method of electronically managing payment media capacity of a payment media handling apparatus" (lines 1-2), while, the claim ends with a recitation of, "wherein the request for a payment media operation is made by an entity including one of at least a till, a bank, a CIT operator and a supervisor" (lines 14-15). The claim does not actually complete the action of "managing the payment media capacity," therefore leading to a disconnect between what the preamble sets forth for the claim to accomplish and what is actually recited in the body of the claim. Similar problems are present in claims 18 and 24. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,014,649 (Kobayashi et al. '649), In view of U.S. PGPb. No. 2002/0111886 (Chenevich et al. '886).

Re Claim 1: Kobayashi et al. '649 disclose a method/system of electronically managing payment media capacity of a payment media handling apparatus, comprising: receiving a request for a payment media operation (Abstract); and wherein a request for a payment media operation is made by an entity including one of at least a till, a bank, a CIT operator and a supervisor (abstract; i.e. cash).

Kobayashi et al. '649 does not explicitly state automatically determining the possibility of performing the requested payment media operation by comparing information provided in the payment media operation request to information including determining the payment media in the payment media handling apparatus; and performing a payment media action based on a result obtained from the automatic determination of the possibility of performing the requested payment media operation (abstract), and wherein the payment media operation includes at least one of a payment media acceptance operation, a start fund operation, a payment media change dispensing operation, a payment media advance operation and a bank deposit operation (abstract). It is considered to be old and well known in the art of automatic

teller machines (ATMs) to verify if there are funds available in the account associated with the payment media (i.e. card) that is inserted into the machine, and that once that has been determined, to accept the operation, and to either provide the requested funds or to allow the deposit of funds into the account.

Re Claim 2: Kobayashi et al. '649 discloses the method/system substantially as claimed, as advanced above, including wherein the request for the payment media operation is automatically provided by a controller in response to instructions stored on a machine-readable storage medium (column 11, line 42 – column 12, line 54).

Re Claim 3: Kobayashi et al. '649 disclose the method/system substantially as claimed, as advanced above, including wherein the request for the payment media operation is provided by an operator (column 11, line 42 – column 12, line 54).

Re Claim 4: Kobayashi et al. '649 disclose the method/system substantially as claimed, as advanced above, with the exception of requiring that the payment media handling apparatus manages the payment media operation for one or more retail stores having one or more payment media originating sources. However, Chenevich et al. '886 disclose a system that manages payment media operations that can occur in multiple places, i.e. for one or more retail stores, having one or more origination sources (paragraph [0061]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kobayashi et al. '649, in view of the

teachings of Chenevich et al. '886, for the basic reason of providing a complete, linked system.

Re Claim 5: Kobayashi et al. '649 disclose the method/system substantially as claimed, as advanced above, with the exception of requiring that the step of performing a payment media action runs parallel to the performance of other payment media actions. However, Chenevich et al. '886 disclose a payment manager that may be part of a market place (i.e. being used by multiple people at the same time; paragraph [0041]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kobayashi et al. '649, in view of the teachings of Chenevich et al. '886, for the basic reason of allowing more than one person to use the system at once.

Re Claim 6: Kobayashi et al. '649 disclose the method/system substantially as claimed, as advanced above, including that the step of determining the possibility of performing the requested payment media operation includes at least a determination of a payment media capacity of the payment media handling apparatus (abstract; column 6, lines 38-46).

Re Claim 7: Kobayashi et al. '649 disclose the method/system substantially as claimed, as advanced above, including that the determination of a payment media capacity of the payment media handling apparatus is performed using one of a physical

measuring device and a payment media accounting technique (column 23, line 23 – column 24, line 10).

Re Claim 8: Kobayashi et al. '649 disclose the method/system substantially as claimed, as advanced above, including a payment media stack height measuring device (Figure 20).

Re Claim 9: Kobayashi et al. '649 disclose the method/system substantially as claimed, as advanced above, including wherein the payment media action comprises at least one of the payment media operation, an annunciation action, a payment media pickup request action, a payment media delivery request action, a payment media pickup redirect action and a payment media deposit redirect action (abstract).

Re Claim 10: Kobayashi et al. '649 disclose the method/system substantially as claimed, as advanced above, with the exception of requiring that the annunciation action informs a supervisory entity in the retail store of the result obtained from the automatic determination of the possibility of performing the requested payment media operation. However, Kobayashi et al. '649 does disclose a clerk that monitors, "information necessary for close examination" as well as a display screen and a print out. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the system to include informing a supervisor (i.e. clerk) of the result of the automatic determination of the possibility to perform the requested

media operation, for the basic reason of alerting the clerk to any problems that may have or will occur.

Re Claim 11: Kobayashi et al. '649 disclose the method/system substantially as claimed, as advanced above, including that the payment media pickup request action and payment media delivery request action are provided to at least one of a banking entity or a cash-in-transit operator (column 1, lines 5-9).

Re Claim 12: Kobayashi et al. '649 disclose the method/system substantially as claimed, as advanced above including that the payment media pickup redirect action and the payment media deposit redirect action direct the operator to another cash handling apparatus to complete the payment media operation (column 5, line 32 - column 6, line 65).

Re Claim 13: Kobayashi et al. '649 disclose the method/system substantially as claimed, as advanced above, including that the step of automatically determining the possibility of performing the requested payment media operation is performed based on at least one of a group of rules stored in a lookup table, instructions provided for a retail store, instructions provided by an entity other than a retail store, and instructions based on real time or substantially real time analysis of payment media activity information that is electronically obtained in a retail store during a predetermined period of time, wherein a retail store includes one or more of at least a single store, multiple stores, one or more

third party concession stands located within a single store and two or more stores located within a mall (column 5, line 32 – column 6, line 65). While Kobayashi et al. '649 does not disclose a mall, it is disclosed that the payment media operations are determined in substantially real time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that this device could be used in a retail environment in order to insure that there is a constant supply of money in the tills.

Re Claim 14: Kobayashi et al. '649 disclose the method/system substantially as claimed, as advanced above, with the exception of requiring that the group of rules includes a consideration of at least one of retailer type, retailer size, retailer location, the specific cash accepting device requesting the payment media action, time of day for the payment media action, calendar date for the payment media action, calendar date of national or local holidays, calendar date of scheduled festivities or organized events, and a retail store scheduled sales event. However, Kobayashi et al. '649 disclose that the payment media devices are monitored in real time, and therefore if it were a holiday, and more cash was needed at a quicker pace, then obviously the device would respond accordingly (column 5, line 32 - column 6, line 65).

Re Claim 15: Kobayashi et al. '649 disclose the method/system substantially as claimed, as advanced above, with the exception of requiring that the payment media activity information comprises electronic point of sale (EPOS) data, payment media

refund amount information, frequency and size of cash refunds processed within a predetermined period of time, dispensed payment media information or received payment media information from an automatic teller machine located in a retail store, a value, type and denomination of payment media available to effect the particular payment media operation, and payment media pickup or delivery information scheduled by a cash-in-transit operator. However, Kobayashi et al. '649 does disclose a clerk that monitors, "information necessary for close examination" as well as a display screen and a print out. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for system to include the aforementioned information for the basic reason of tracking the amount of money going through the terminal.

Re Claim 16: Kobayashi et al. '649 disclose the method/system substantially as claimed, as advanced above, with the exception of requiring that the instructions provided by the entity other than a retail store are provided to a retail store via a communication network. However, Chenevich et al. '886 discloses that all of the players involved in the payment media process are connected through a network (see Figure 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kobayashi et al. '649, in view of the teachings of Chenevich et al. '886, for the basic reason of insuring that all involved in the payment media process know what is going on.

Re Claim 17: Kobayashi et al. '649 disclose the method/system substantially as claimed, as advanced above, including that the step of performing the payment media action requires no additional input from the operator other than the request for the payment media operation (see Figure 21).

Claims 18, 19, and 24 are substantially similar to the claims, as advanced above, and are therefore rejected under the same rationale. Arguments to the contrary should include applicant's reasoning why they are not substantially similar, yet are similar enough as to not incur a restriction requirement.

Conclusion

Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the response, to consider fully the entire references as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts of disclosed by the examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LINDSAY M. MAGUIRE whose telephone number is (571)272-6039. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Abdi can be reached on (571) 272-6702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Lindsay M. Maguire
5/21/08
/Lindsay M Maguire/
Examiner, Art Unit 3692

/Kambiz Abdi/
Supervisory Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 3692